CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLII, Nos 3 & 4 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* March/April 1990

The A.B.C. of Politics

BANKERS AND BOLSHEVISM

by Rosine de Bounevialle

ONE of the latest "vital issues" to be discussed and dissected with monotonous regularity is what is termed "education" in the Britain of today. Teenagers leaving the state schools, we are told, are too often and increasingly illiterate and/or innumerate. However that may be, one does not have to meet many ex-pupils of whatever age to become aware that even when they can read, write and reckon, they are still left to flounder through life without any initial instruction in the eternal verities or even in the hard facts of the usurious way of life we presently endure. Worse than that, for every one illiterate and innumerate product turned out by the national education system, there are probably a hundred or more political illiterates who will eventually comprise the voting population in any so-called Democracy.

An ignorant electorate is thus induced to vote for some almost equally ignorant person, selected to camouflage and perpetuate the oligarchy that finances itself by the age-old system of seemingly owning nothing and yet lending all things to all men - so long as they are prepared to pay the interest, of course! This is the "open" secret that is closed to all but initiates. This is the state of affairs in the affairs of state that is not known in schools, not studied in universities, and certainly not told in the press or shown on the ubiquitous "box".

Slay-Slide Towards One World

We few, who by the grace of God had enough right instruction or sufficient intellectual curiosity to discover the truth for ourselves, are denied even a public soapbox, let alone a housetop, from which to pass our knowledge on to others. The story of our slavery and the identity of our masters must continue to be declaimed from such private rooms and paper platforms as cannot be denied us as long as it is necessary for the fiction of a "free world" to be mentioned.

1990 seems a particularly appropriate year to try once again to publicise how this wretched state of affairs came about in England, and to underline the role played by Bankers in the slay-slide we are on towards the One World that has been the goal of usurers ever since Eden. This is the little known and less celebrated seventh centenary of the expulsion of the Jews from Edward I's England. Seven hundred years ago, they were the bankers of their day. Living by lending money at interest was contrary to the laws obtaining in all Christendom. These first bankers were thus an "occasion of sin" which, it appears, weak Christians found it hard to resist even though the wages of their

sin was often ruin. It seems hardly a coincidence that after the money-lenders' enforced and reluctant departure overseas, the value of the national currency (gold) issued free by the Crown did not alter for three hundred years. They were expelled from this land, bag and baggage, i.e. with all their money and goods, and forbidden ever to return because they had resented and refused every effort of the Church to convert them to the Christian faith which would, of course, have entailed the abandonment of their usurious monopoly.

Perhaps this ban on their immigration that has remained on the statute book to this day accounts for their return over the centuries since the so-called Reformation always in the guise of "Dutch" bankers or "German" bankers or indeed any other nationality that ensured residence in this country once usurious banking had been revived in legal form. We have only to consider our current homosexual and abortion laws to realise how popular legality can render acceptable a practice previously abhorred, which thus becomes destructive of the very fabric of the society that allows it.

Growth of the Money Power

The Elizabethan trickle of the money-lending returnees and new-comers became under Cromwell, a flood, despite his refusal to lift the formal ban on their immigration. Wars, especially civil wars, have to be financed; much better to have the financiers on the premises, so to speak, rather than having to travel bowl in hand to Lombardy or wherever the best interest rates could be obtained. The Stuart kings, the last of our true monarchs, were demolished and defeated by that same Money Power that Edward the Plantagenet thought he had banished forever. William of Orange was founder of the dynasty of puppets who have right royally confused their people to this day.

"Whenever failure looms, create a war" became the policy of all days. Six years after the Inglorious Revolution, the perfect instrument to nourish these was clamped on to a people who still speak of being "safe as the Bank of England" when they wish to exemplify the probity of any institution. The Bank of England was never anything but a Bank in England for founding and fostering a hydra called the National Debt. It began in an almost unnoticeable and unnoticed way: a few million pounds lent at five per cent interest to the Government of the country wanting to finance a war. No prizes for guessing who was to pay the interest of the hydra throwing out the heads demanded to defray the more pressing expenses of the War of the Spanish Succession, the War of of the Austrian Succession, the American Revolution, The War of Jenkins' Ear, the Peninsular War, the Napoleonic Wars....

The Bolshevik Connection

"What has all that to do with Bolshevism?" you may ask. This: when a country of usurious residence becomes so debt impoverished as to be nothing but a ruin concealed behind a seemingly solid facade, it is time for the Money Power to move on to fresh woods before the inhabitants begin to identify the trees in the home park. In 1913, the Money Power moved to the U.S.A., there to create with practised deviousness a fresh hydra called the Federal Reserve System. A National Debt by any other name is still a National Debt. Lo and behold! One year later the first world carnage began and in the midst of all the death and destruction seven more hydra heads sprang out of the neck in New York.

One of them was Bolshevism (life blood by courtesy of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. in the first instance). After that, it is difficult to move even a financial pebble without finding some usurious growth under it.

So what with Bolshevism and its respectable offspring, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having done their stint with a Second World War, and a variety of multi-coloured revolutions having created a pile of wreckage where the Almighty Dollar used to be, it looks as if the Money Power is on the move again and might be going on a Yellow Passport instead of the rather tattered Red one. Are we to see Chinese chequers or a row of bonsai on the tables of the latest financial establishments?

*** In case anyone is interested, the most recent figure we have on file for the size of the National Debt in England was £197,000 million pounds [**Sunday Express**, 18/12/88], but interest being what it is the Debt has no doubt grown astronomically since then, despite the Thatcher financial watchdogs' £15 billion said to have been paid off it this year.

WITHOUT BENEFIT OF THE CLERGY

EARLY in January a number of courageous men and women mounted a "Rescue" operation outside the Liverpool Abortoir, and were arrested. Among them was the Rev. James Morrow who had travelled from Scotland. Fr. Morrow had challenged the Archbishop and Bishop of Liverpool to join the demonstration.

According to a report in the **Catholic Pictorial** church leaders, including these two, had "distanced" themselves from the action, judging that it might be counter-productive in the battle against abortion. This is odd to say the least. Some years ago, the British National Party booked a conference in the Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool. The building was immediately infenestrated by a large crowd, principally of the immigrant population, swelled by Trotskyites and New Leftists. The Archbishop and Bishop made all haste to join this crowd, which was interfering with the civil rights of others, and sought an interview with the hotel management, urging them to "be sensitive to people's feelings" and cancel the booking.

It was the Bishop of Liverpool who torpedoed the "White Bill" which would have greatly reduced abortions, speaking against it on the day before it was debated in the House. It was the Archbishop of Liverpool at the last General Election who spoke out against "single issue campaigns" (he particularly had in mind the voters' veto against abortionist candidates) as being at variance with democracy. On the contrary, given the nature of Party manifestos - take all, leave all - and their use of "carrier policies", the "voters' veto" and the single issue are the only way in which the electorate can determine an election in their own favour.

With "leaders" like these, who needs David Steele?

[With acknowledgement to **Liverpool Newsletter**, Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH. Subscription £2 per annum.]

CUT AND THRUST

Janus offers candid comments on news from home and abroad

TWO plain-clothes soldiers in Ulster shoot and kill three men who, apparently armed, are carrying out a robbery. Immediately and predictably there is a demand from the Opposition Front Bench for an enquiry; the Dublin government demands a full report on the incident; there are accusations of the authorities carrying out a "shoot to kill" policy; and demonstrators in Ireland display banners accusing those involved of being murderers. Not until police and troops in Ulster are armed only with walking sticks will honest terrorists and criminals be able to go about their business without fear!

Had the reverse been the case, of course, with the I.R.A. killing several police or soldiers, what a deafening silence there would have been! The Opposition would have been mute, the Eire government would have said nothing and nobody would have so much as mentioned the I.R.A.'s "shoot to kill" policy. As Arnold Lunn said on one occasion, it's a case of "selective indignation".

* * * *

NELSON Mandela has been released from his five-star prison amid press and T.V. coverage that would have been deemed excessive had he been raised from the dead. The ceremony was a little marred by some of his younger and wilder-eyed supporters who, in the mistaken belief that "uhuru" was already here, started looting shops. The great man himself, addressing a mob of followers, paid service to those who had supported him, notably the "South African" Communist Party and, to a lesser extent, the churches, although Archbishop Tutu's name seemed to be missing from the roll of honour. Mrs Thatcher, we are told, viewed Mandela's reference to "continuing the armed struggle" with some misgivings, but not so the riff-raff that spent the day dancing a celebratory jig outside the South African Embassy in Trafalgar Square. Their banners were in favour of continuing sanctions until Doomsday. In fact, Doomsday is probably the most apt description of what the future now holds for South Africans.

No details were given by St. Nelson as to what form the "armed struggle" would take - whether the bullet and necklace favoured by Big Winnie, the torture and murder employed by her "Football Club", or the poisoning by African servants of their employers' drinks advocated by some other brute whose name escapes us at the moment. Perhaps Mandela will return to his original tactic of terrorist bombing. He was, after all, sentenced for the possession of explosives with criminal intent. Fortunately, both for him and his victims, he was arrested in time, or else he would have been executed. Or is it tactless to mention such a thing?

* * * *

MRS Kathleen Mountstephen, Lord Mayor of Bristol, has replaced the muskrat trimmings on her official robes with artificial fur in protest at the trade in animal skins, which she describes as barbaric. "Not only has it saved the council and ratepayers £300 on the coat's renewal," she commented in the **Daily Telegraph** on January 24, "but it

saves an animal's life." Just think how many human lives might be saved if the good lady Lord Mayor were to take as unequivocal a stand against the continuing trade in unwanted babies' lives in the city's abortion clinics. Isn't that a barbaric practice? What has she to say about the "silent scream" of babies facing the slaughterer's knife?

The specious arguments thrown out by abortionists from all four quarters of the media remind us of a conundrum posed to medical students by an Australian gynaecologist. "A woman comes to see one of you asking for an abortion; this is her eighth pregnancy, two of her children have died. Her husband is an alcoholic and the family lives in great poverty. She herself is sick, probably with T.B. Would you urge her to have an abortion?" Most of the students say yes, of course they would advise the abortion. Then, says the gynaecologist, you have just deprived the world of the music of Ludwig van Beethoven. Because the case that's been described was that of Maria Lyam, Beethoven's mother.

* * * *

SOUTH Africa's electrified border fence, called the "snake of fire", has now officially claimed more lives than the Berlin Wall, according to the **Sunday Express** on January 28. The fence is Pretoria's response to the wave of refugees from the internal fighting in Mozambique and the obvious difference from the Berlin Wall is that it is intended to keep people out of South Africa - and people, too, who are supposed to have received their freedom already. The do-gooders who are protesting about the "fearsome fence", like U.S. Senator Pat Leahy of Vermont, presumably want South Africa to be majority-ruled like Mozambique. Then where will the refugees be heading for? Or will the fence serve to keep the people in Mandela's "Azania"?

No one has yet explained to our satisfaction why the world's indignation is always directed at South Africa, while Pol Pot, the student massacre in Peking, killings in the Kashmir and Ceylon, and various other acts of violence around the world merit no more than a mild "Tut(u)-Tut(u)". Even Israeli atrocities against Palestinians in their own homeland result in no more than a slightly raised eyebrow! Both Australia and New Zealand have been very critical of whatever South Africa does, but let them beware. They both have coloured, indigenous populations claiming to have been trodden underfoot. It could well be that by the end of the century they will be sporting pariahs, with no-one wanting to play cricket with them!

* * * *

MOST people are financial muddlers without firm goals or plans and do not know how much they have in their bank accounts, according to a Gallup survey reported in the **Evening Standard** of February 8. They treat personal finance in a cavalier manner and their ambitions are merely short-term. Fewer than a third of the people interviewed have any financial goals for the next ten years, with the prevailing attitude being "do it tomorrow". No wonder the bankers and financiers are happy. What would wipe the smile off their faces would be a widespread desire by people to pay off their loans (a mere 17 per cent expressed this as their goal) or even, perish the thought, not to contract loans in the first place.

Part of the problem, as Peter McKay pointed out in his **Standard** column

a few days before, is that money lending is now described as a "product". This is done to make money lending sound respectable, because we all admire people who make products. In fact, fiddling around with money is not a product because nothing is produced at all. It is true that investing money here or there might result in a profit, but that gain has not been produced in any real sense of the word. That is why the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages completely prohibited money-lending and put it on a par with sodomy as a "sin against natural increase"! Perhaps we would be less of a nation of money muddlers if we got back to calling money-lending by its proper name - usury!

One reader, incidentally, has written to suggest that we should press the police and local authorities for "fulfilment of contract" on this matter. Unless they are prepared to enforce King Edward I's anti-usury laws of 1275, we should feel no obligation to pay their salaries through the new Poll Tax!

* * * *

ARCHAEOLOGISTS investigating the royal necropolis of Sutton Hoo in Suffolk believe that slaves were sacrificed and interred there so they could accompany the pagan Saxon kings to the afterlife following their lavish ship burials. The slaves were garrotted and beheaded so that their masters and mistresses would be served in the hereafter. How the neo-pagans of the Right (who are very Wrong) can praise the "achievements" of such barbarians is beyond our comprehension. Thank God for the Christian missionaries!

* * * *

THE impressive-sounding Community and Race Relations Unit of the British Council of Churches has heavily criticised the number of Black people in British prisons today, we saw in a recent issue of the **Catholic Herald**. Despite being "only" 4.5 per cent of the population as a whole, 14 per cent of male prisoners and 24 per cent of female inmates are Black. The implication, of course, is that it is the fault of the police or the bench, and that the figures "prove" there is racial discrimination in the authorities' arrest and sentencing procedures. By the same reasoning, we suppose, the fact that at the last Olympics Black athletes were "over-represented" by a factor of about 15 "proves" the selectors were discriminating against White athletes. Perhaps they did! Or is the fallacy of mindless egalitarianism now so firmly embedded in people's minds that rational discourse on the subject is pretty well impossible?

We suspect this is the case at the "British" Broadcasting Corporation. B.B.C. Radio has been advertising for trainees to work on various news programmes like **The World At One**. To a suitably inclined young person they are mouth-watering opportunities. There is a snag, however. If you are White, Brown or Yellow, you needn't bother applying because the advertisement quite plainly states that the vacancies are for Black candidates only: "Training opportunities for Black people," the advert is headlined. If any other employer this side of Pretoria advertised jobs for White people only, there would be cries of "racism", followed by the prospect of a heavy fine or even a spell "inside". Yet the "Beeb" can get away with reverse racism. It even has the temerity to add a pious little rider to the effect that the B.B.C. is an "equal opportunities employer"!

HILAIRE BELLOC — AT WAR AGAINST THE SERVILE STATE

by E. MERRILL ROOT

THIS article by Professor Root first appeared in the February 1970 issue of **American Opinion**. Hilaire Belloc saw the world coming under the control of a few (largely hidden) manipulators, with the power of the Banks and Financiers stifling the spirit of private enterprise. Prof. Root's article throws revealing light on the kind of capitalism where enterprise is no longer free; where the manipulators of the giant corporations, foundations, bureaucracies and cartels use capitalism as a pretence and socialism as a means.

HE WAS born Joseph Peter René Hilaire Belloc, but he sharpened his name to the melodious yet arrow-trim Hilaire. As a man and writer he has grown in reputation for insight with the decades, and he still stands, as poet and philosopher, in the forefront of the modern battle for sanity.

Belloc and G. K. Chesterton were complementary artists and philosophers, friends and fellow workers, greatly different in style and temperaments but one in their belief that never could "any increase of comfort or security be a sufficient good to be bought at the price of liberty."

That is, they were both enemies of Socialism and Communism; and, of course, enemies of the Servile State that is the device of the ruling Insiders — a crafty device which would reduce the many mansions of God's universe to a stockyard feeding the greed of hidden men, and bring on "One World" where the riches of the fugue of individual man are muted to a monotone.

G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc, temperamentally and as artists, were greatly different. Chesterton was fluidly alive, flashing and flowing like a river that makes glad the City of God — humorous, imaginative, audacious, gay and playful, and rich in life with varied gusto. Belloc on the other hand, was more like craggy mountain country, strong with rock ridges, less fluid and rich, more stoney and restrained, less given to gorgeous rhetoric and headlong paradox, less exuberant with life. Belloc wrote a purer and more essential prose which at its best is as much a model of bare power as Swift's, and in its essence a strength forever.

And it seems right that it was the unadorned and fiercely strong Belloc who wrote of the positivists and collectivists the noble words of dismissal. They seemed (and seem) victorious; they seem to occupy, triumphant, the battlefield of the world today. But Belloc knew long ago that they had already failed in time because they fail in Eternity; and so he wrote: "Do not, I beg you, be oppressed by forces already dissolved. You have mistaken the hour of the night. It is already morning."

ENEMY OF SOCIALISM

Why did Belloc oppose Socialism as a sort of bollweevil in the fields of the world? Robert Speaight, in his fine "Life of Hilaire Belloc," wrote that to Belloc:

> *"The Socialist State was a state in which all the means of production — transport, land and machines — would be owned by the politicians. The politicians might be democratically elected, or they might not; that was irrelevant to the Socialist thesis. They might enforce their distribution of wealth equally, or at least equitably; or they might not. The point was that the moral responsibility of ownership would be exercised not by the people but by the politicians."*

Belloc had been in politics. He had been a member of Parliament. He had seen the politicians in action. So he knew what a State in the hands of the politicians would be like, and he did not want to live in it; and he knew that no happy and creative people could live under it.

PERSONAL HONOUR AND FREEDOM

Hilaire Belloc (says Speaight) wished "a form of society where personal honor and personal freedom would be safeguarded; the only form of society natural to western man." He knew that the baseness of so much of the modern world made men desire quick, immediate salvation by the cheapest and easiest means. He knew that, in their longing become panic and haste, men might turn to *man* for salvation — and find themselves betrayed. As he wrote in "Survivals and New Arrivals":

> *"The expectation of better things — the confident expectation of their advent — affects the vileness and folly of our time everywhere. Let one individual appear with the capacity or chance to crystallize these hopes and the enemy will have arrived. For then Anti-Christ will be man.*

Always Belloc knew that the problems of economics and politics, while they needed solution, left a void that no economics or politics could fill. Suppose by some miracle that they were solved:

> *"But after that? Will there not remain the chief problem of the soul? Shall we not smell what Chesterton so admirably calls "the unmistakable smell of the pit," shall we not need salvation with a need greater than the need for water upon a parched day?"*

This is even more evident today, with crime, rebellion, drugs, obscenity, and anarchy drowning us. That insight into the primary need of a faith, a philosophy, a religion that transcends Man and the devices of Man, is one of the things that makes Belloc central and sound. He saw, always, the great danger of the proud arrogance of Lucifer, returning to complete the abolition of Man in the name of Man. He saw and knew that we live under the shadow of peril; that the enemies of God plan the subjugation of Man; and that the bugle blows always for battle.

Belloc knew, long before Whittaker Chambers, what the latter came at last to know: Communism "is the vision of man's mind displacing God as the creative intelligence of the world." And (again before Chambers knew and said it): "Economics is not the central problem of this century . . . Faith is the central problem of this age. The Western world does not know it, but it already possesses the answer to this problem — but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom He enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in Man."

Belloc knew and said this; it was his central

strength.

PREVIEW OF THINGS TO COME

Hilaire Belloc's "The Servile State" was an analysis of a situation and a preview of things to come. It foresaw our present Welfare State, that "planner's Paradise," where the means of the Socialists are used to serve the ends of the Insiders.

A superficial mind might easily be misled by his terms. Belloc was a mortal enemy of Socialism and of Communism; but he was also a drastic critic of *a kind* of "Capitalism" — the "Capitalism" where capital was not diffused among many; where enterprise was no longer free, but stifled by giant corporations, foundations, bureaucracies, cartels; where canny Insiders *used* capitalism as a pretense, and Socialism as a means.

Belloc saw the world coming under the control of a very few (largely hidden) manipulators, with the power of the banks and financiers depriving more and more of us of money and even more, of capital and the means of production.

He really was *for* a true capitalism, but he saw around him a world where "Capitalism" was becoming confiscatory of the capital of the forgotten man. More and more men were becoming wage earners rather than free workmen on their own land, with their own business, by their own capital.

BECAME LESS AND LESS FREE

Belloc knew that liberty, however — *freedom* however — came only to those who had their own capital. Increasingly, as men lost their sense of property — their own property — they became less and less free . . . less and less concerned with freedom . . . What they sought, then, as a desperate *need*, was security. And the Insiders the finance-capitalists, the spiders spinning their calamitous webs in the shadows, realized that they must concede security as they took away liberty. Belloc believed that the planner-Socialists — the Ramsay MacDonalds, the Sidney Webbs, the Bernard Shaws, "were confiscating income . . . they did not even propose to confiscate capital" from the Insiders. Robert Speaight saw it this way:

> *"The Servile State did, indeed, fulfil the minimum condition of prophecy, in so far as it saw through a glass darkly. It saw that men in modern industrial societies would willingly give up their freedom to secure sufficiency and security. It doubted — and with good reason — whether the instinct of property was sufficiently vigorous in these societies to enforce that distribution of productive wealth (not of income) which Belloc believed to be the only social doctrine consonant with a Christian philosophy. The moment, he feared, had passed."*

Yet, like him, we fight on, fight on, knowing that the only life worth living by free men is a life where every form of collective control is broken by men secure because of the free possession of *their own property productive of wealth.*

This explains many things that otherwise would seem incredible and inexplicable. Why do so many "Capitalists," why do so many "men of wealth," make a truce with Socialism, and use Socialist means like the income tax, and all the "social" panaceas, and all the coercions of Big Government? Because, by so doing, and by so giving "social security," they seduce men into docility, they lure men into servility, they establish their own hidden control under the pretense of "social justice."

A CONSPIRACY AND CRIME

The Servile State — which is the state in which we now live — is a strategy of the spider-men. It is, on their part, a conspiracy and a crime. But it is also due to the blindness of the many men whose true life would be one of freedom; men blinded that they might sell their free Republic for mere security.

Belloc saw the State as becoming a "more or less benevolent slave-owner." He believed that "the rich would organize the poor with the poor's consent." How true today — with the white and the black recipients of "Welfare" allowing themselves to be *organized* by revolutionaries financed by the Establishment foundations. The riffraff of men allowing their freedom to be taken away for a pretence (how fragile!) of "security."

Speaight did not fully understand all of this, as I think Belloc did, and he did not recognize that the "State" was only a front for the Insiders. To Belloc, this was the drift of the modern world — only to be arrested in a renaissance of freedom by the will of men who see the truth and use it to make the world free.

The answer as Belloc saw it, if it was still possible, lay in what he called *distributism*. This was not the distributing of income; it was the accumulation of more and more property among more and more men. The owner of land, of a printing press (or presses), of a store or a medical practise, of a shop and an industry or art, was on the way toward a true freedom. He was an emigrant from the Servile State to the Free Republic. He was an individual and not a mass man.

Could this still be done? Belloc believed, as Chesterton believed even more hopefully, that the answer lay in the soul of man.

CORRELATION WITH COMMUNISM

"The Servile State," in style, is somewhat bleak and formidable. It is neither pleasant reading nor fine art; it is like the naked bones of thought. Nor can we say that it is the final work, nor the most perfect thought or statement that we shall have; but it is a book so enlightening, so revealing, so prophetic, that no one who would understand our dilemma and our predicament can afford not to know it.

The book was written in 1912. We today have passed through the hypocracies of a Woodrow Wilson, of an F. D. R., of their shoddy successors, and have been increasingly entrapped in the Servile State Belloc foresaw.

Today Americans are beginning to see this — the correlation between Communism on the outside and the Conspiracy on the inside. And as we see it, and as we say so in terms that ordinary men can understand, we prepare for a possible renaissance of man. To know the truth is the only way to make salvation possible.

FORESAW THE PRESENT

The basic thesis of "The Servile State" — that too many men will relinquish liberty for security — that the crafty few will use this to establish their own power and control — that capital in the hands of individual men will be the only answer and salvation — is essentially sound today even more than in 1912, when the condition was only incipient.

Clearly "the Servile State" is a classic. It foresaw, more than half a century ago, what too horribly we see all around us today.

CONSERVATIVE'S DEDICATION

I am only one,
But I *am* one;
I cannot do everything
But I *can* do something.
And what I can do
That I *ought* to do;
And what I ought to do,
By the Grace of God
I *will* do.

— Edward E. Hale.

FROM EACH ACCORDING TO HIS ABILITY

by NOEL HUNT

A RECENT report from the Department of Employment says that six million of the workforce are illiterate or innumerate. As things stand, these people are virtually unemployable. They can only become more so as they get older and as the need grows for more skills to meet the needs of a technological society. The thought of this large group living on welfare for ever, and likely in the process to breed others to replace themselves, is frightening. It represents, too, an enormous and ever-growing burden on the tax-payer. Anything which will lighten this load is to be commended.

A glimmer of hope is to be found in the recent talk in government circles about getting value for money. Such an attitude makes it possible for the problem of the illiterate worker to be treated realistically. An essential first step would be to repeal all minimum wage regulations. This would allow the illiterate and innumerate to earn what their services are worth in the open market. No man is entitled to more, no matter how moving the rhetoric about "a man is entitled to a living wage." He is not. What he is entitled to is the value of his services in the open market - no more and no less. Once free of the restrictions imposed by a minimum wage system, there would be nothing to prevent the illiterates from taking such jobs as they could find, or as could be created for them.

Improving Service To The Public

Businesses constantly seek to make themselves more attractive to potential customers. Light portering and delivery services would be appreciated by shoppers, and so would boost turnover. This service, once common, can be restored only if employers are allowed to bargain with the illiterate and thus to arrive at what both regard as a fair wage. This means that employers must be liberated from the strait-jacket of minimum wages and maximum hours worked by youths. If a youth wishes to increase his earnings by working longer and harder, why should he not? Among the evils of socialism is its active discouragement of excellence and individual achievement. We should let the young people we are talking about have a chance to work as hard as they wish for what they see as a fair wage.

This large pool of potential workers could be used, too, to bring back the telegram delivery boy with his cycle and smart uniform. Many of us can remember the convenience and efficiency of this service. With an effrontery one can only admire, the Post Office closed down this service as part of an economy drive and "to improve our service to the public". If the Post Office is reluctant to bring back telegrams, then let private enterprise have its chance; it being stipulated that they strive to recruit from the pool of illiterates and innumerates in the first place. [But how could they read the address on the telegram? - Editor.]

The farming industry could absorb a great many illiterates. Green issues, the environment and a care for the earth are highly fashionable causes at present. Why should the illiterate not be encouraged to take up farm work? Large-scale human employment would tend to reduce the

number of machines. To environmentalists this is all to the good. The suggestion ought to be supported by taxpayers as well; it will help to reduce the amount they must pay to support the unemployed. It would be necessary to devise a scheme to enable farmers to pay off what they owe on machines, so that humans could replace combine harvesters. This should not be difficult: civil servants exist only to devise and administer such schemes. As humans replaced machines, we should have to turn again to draught animals. This would reduce the need for artificial fertilisers: a proposal which should be supported by all environmentalists.

It will be objected that all this will cost money. This is true. It is equally true that as matters stand at present the illiterates and innumerates will draw the dole for ever as unemployable. This means that they will cost an enormous amount and do nothing in return for it. The suggestions made above at least enable them to do something to earn some money, to reduce the burden they impose on the state and, perhaps most important of all, to feel useful and needed. To attain these advantages, it is well worth while paying a farmer's machinery loan for him, scrapping the machine and cancelling the farmer's indebtedness.

Easing The Tax Payer's Burden

It is likely that the illiterate would earn less than what is needed to support him. In such cases there is nothing to prevent income support allowances being paid. The man is helping himself, doing a useful job, learning a trade and, above all, earning some money. The alternative is to continue with the present system. This means that the illiterate and innumerate will draw the dole for ever, do no work and contribute nothing to the state. We can be sure that private enterprise, once allowed to pay illiterates what they are worth in the open market, will find uses for them. We should encourage this. Every person so employed and earning, no matter how little, eases the taxpayer's burden.

We live in an unjust world. If it were a just one, we would insist that the teachers responsible for sending out these illiterates and innumerates should be sought out and penalised. It is regrettable that nothing so salutary will happen; any such attempt would be branded as "insensitive" or some other liberal term of disapprobation. Yet it seems that nothing less will bring the leaders of the teaching profession to their senses. So we shall continue to see a government allegedly intent on raising teaching standards still seeking advice as to how this can be done from educationalists, inspectors and teachers' representatives who have, by their own professional ineptitude and liberal-leftist ideological outlook, created the very ill which we seek to remedy. All that can be expected from them is a recommendation that methods which have already failed disastrously be extended still further. A Chinese proverb tells us "He who has failed three times sets up as an instructor." This neatly summarises the position of those failed educationalists who cannot teach, yet insist on telling others how to do it.

If we lack the resolution to send packing the incompetents who have lumbered us with this vast number of illiterates, let us at least reduce the financial burden they lay on our shoulders by encouraging the young to work as is suggested above. It is not their fault that they are virtually unemployable as matters stand. We should give them a chance to help themselves and society as a whole. If this means shattering a few liberal shibboleths, all the better.

THE ANATOMY OF LIBERALISM

by G.K. YOUNG

The philosophy which lies at the root of England's decadence is liberalism. Liberalism has become not only the official ideology of the establishment, but also a quasitotalitarian creed imposed more subtly and therefore more dangerously than Marxism-Leninism in the unregenerate parts of Eastern Europe. Yet liberalism is an ideology that is worthy of no respect, a form of moral decay, a refusal of the will to power which creates great civilizations.

Liberalism is the common thread of madness that binds together a diseased establishment which subsidizes both the foreign competitors who are putting our entrepreneurs out of business and our workers out of their jobs, and the muggers and other human detritus that pollute our inner cities. It is the frame of mind that loves every country but this and every people but our own, prefering the immigrant to the Englishman, the IRA man to the Loyalist, the criminal to the policeman, the judge and even the victim. If it is not destroyed, it will destroy us all and civilization itself, as the rising tide of urban anarchy floods over the whole land and turns England into a giant Harlem.

However, liberalism comes in two varieties. This dichotomy tends to camouflage its fundamental totalitarianism. We shall consider first modern liberalism, the philosophy of the post-war consensus.

The salient features of modern liberalism are sentimentality, moral cowardice and inverse racism.

Perversion of Christianity

Liberal sentimentality is a degenerate and perverted form of Christian charity, which is not surprising, since liberalism itself is a degenerate and secularized form of Christianity. As Ronald Butt observes:

> ...man is by nature a somewhat religious creature and in a period when the supernatural is at a discount, he tends to seek his absolutes in social and economic theories, the application of which will bring all things into a natural harmony...

Charity in the non-patronizing sense of concern for one's fellow citizen was a positive force in middle class England in the nineteenth century, because it to some extent balanced the ruthlessly exploitative Gradgrindism that so often flourished amongst the bourgeoisie of that age. The condition of the poor in the 1840s was desperate, as any reader of Dickens or Disraeli will know. Utilitarian philosophy regarded the poor as mere raw material of the capitalist production process, to be used up and thrown away.

This view was rightly rejected by many Tories who saw rich and poor alike as members of the family of the nation with a common destiny and mutual obligations and rights. All the social reforms, factories acts, *etc.* of the last century were accordingly initiated by Tory administrations and opposed by the Whigs/Liberals whose

philosophy at that time rejected any interference in the free functioning of market forces, *e.g.* women working in coal mines, child chimney sweeps, phosphorous poisoned match girls and all the other delights of the unregulated free market for which certain elements of the modern Conservative party feel an overwhelming nostalgia.

Unfortunately the positive force of concern for one's fellow citizen is dangerously subject to degeneration. This can take three quite different forms, all which are obnoxious. The first is the merely patronizing "Lady Bountiful" attitude: shawls and bowls of soup given condescendingly to the deserving poor, who are regarded as pets, not human beings. The second and worse form is Socialism, which perverts solidarity with the working classes and a refusal of exploitation into a rejection of solidarity with anybody else. This leads to a rejection of the very idea of the nation as a community, no less surely than does extreme capitalism. Examples of upperclass Englishmen whose justified feeling that something had to be done to help the unemployed of 1930s England led them ultimately into class war politics are of course Burgess, Philby and their circle. Their cases show how true it is to say that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. The third case is that which concerns us here, modern liberalism. It is in a sense a combination of the first two.

Liberals reject the rigid theoretical approach of Marxists, and content themselves with a much vaguer philosophy, which, as we have observed, is largely a corrupted and secularized version of Christianity.

Man-Centred Religion

God is replaced as an object of worship by Mankind (or Personkind, if you are a feminist!) It is noticeable how clergymen who are nominally Christians but really liberals will openly speak of "horizontal" religion, *i.e.*, the worship of God as immanent in humanity in opposition to the "vertical" religion of traditional Christians, whether Protestants or Catholics, who see God as exterior and infinitely superior to the creation.

Just as traditional Christians see all men as equal before God, so liberals see all men as equal, but in the here and now. As Nietzsche perceptively observed, a theoretical egalitarianism deemed to exist in another world does little practical harm in hierarchical societies where neither nations nor individuals are treated as equals. Nineteenth century Anglicanism, Lutheranism and Catholicism were an integral part of the social structure and ideological make up of ruthless colonizing powers such as Great Britain, Germany and France. Kipling, who was a devout member of the Church of England, accepted social inequality and racial inequality as part of the natural order of things, a correct view which is nevertheless not exactly common amongst modern Anglicans!

However, most liberals, even clergymen, have long since lost their faith in God, and certain results logically follow. Religious zeal is perverted into an obsessive and undifferentiated love of "humanity". Egalitarianism is immediately transferred to this world. The Christian religion condemns pride in the sense of a

man claiming to be superior to God, but the liberal religion rejects "pride" in the sense of one man claiming to be superior to another. This is a rejection of reality.

Sin is transferred from personal moral conduct to social attitudes. Essentially, the only sin is to reject egalitarianism, everything else is permitted. As we have said, sentimentality now embraces the whole of Mankind and since all men are equal, we must not discriminate (as though the function of the mind were not to discriminate!) between failure and success, sponger and worker, the gifted and the talentless.

Evil is perceived not as the result of a deliberate choice on the part of the evildoer, but as the result of unjust social structures, which have denied criminals and scroungers "a fair chance". Theft, mugging, rape, riot and arson are seen as so many "cries for help" in the face of "social injustice". The liberal, driven by love for his fellow man, must respond by transferring moral responsibility to someone, anyone, but the evildoer. The very idea of retribution for the evil done by the criminal is utterly rejected.

Moral cowardice now comes into its own. In the real world, which is so very different from the world of liberal theories, failure to punish criminals causes them rightly to despise society as weak, and to prey upon it even more. Weakness is always despised and always exploited. The liberal is a moral coward in that he refuses to accept blame for the consequences of his actions. The squeamish liberal who refuses to allow rapists and muggers to be flogged and forced to do hard labour in prisons, or to allow murderers to be hanged, is responsible when those criminals reoffend. The liberal chooses to take the risk that horrible crimes will be committed, often against women, children or the elderly, rather than to inflict punishments that are true retribution for the crime and a real deterrent for the future. The liberal's hand is on the mugger's cosh and the murderer's knife.

Integration For <u>You</u>, Brother!

Another aspect of the moral cowardice so often found amongst liberals is their refusal to live (quite literally) with the consequences of their philosophy. Dear, dear Douglas Hurd, Woy Jenkins, "nice" Shirley Williams and co. do not for some strange reason choose to live on the Broawater Farm estate, where many poor white OAPs enjoy the fruits of the liberal establishment's multicultural policies. Liberals cling to their social privileges and often combine snobbery and wealth in their day-to-day lives with a theoretical commitment to equality. Walk around Hampstead, and you will see what we mean. Indeed, liberals love to patronize the "underdog", and have often imbibed condescension with their mothers' milk.

The third and most obviously destructive aspect of liberalism is its inverse racism. This is in part an aspect of egalitarianism. Since neither individuals nor nations are naturally equal, the strong have to be persecuted and the succesful dragged down into the gutter to make them equal to the weak and the mediocre. Equality of outcome replaces equality of opportunity as the goal. This vicious hatred of quality (for what is "equality" but the

absence of quality?) is only part of the explanation for liberal anti-racism. This is also motivated by the secret thoughts which lurk in the subconscious. All liberal theory is contradicted by experience. To be a liberal with a good conscience, it is therefore necessary to live in an ivory tower, which is where many liberals do live. However, the little contact that liberals have with the real world causes them to conceive secret doubts about the validity of their philosophy. The strong minded and intellectually honest will pursue those doubts to their logical conclusion, a rejection of liberalism. The cowardly and self-deceiving push them to the back of their minds and mouth liberal slogans all the louder because they do not in their heart of hearts believe them. They merely think that they ought to believe them, which is a very different thing.

Liberal anti-racism is often a form of overcompensation for latent racism, so secret that the thinker of such forbidden thoughts has to hide them from himself. What better way to do so than by persecuting those who publicly say what you do not wish to admit to yourself that you also think?

It must be an uncomfortable thought for liberals that in this regard they resemble certain morality lobby activists, whose real motive is often repressed sexual desire!

Nationalism By Proxy

Another good way of assuaging feelings of guilt is to transfer nationalism to another group, the traitor's way.

George Orwell observed as long ago as 1945 in his essay *Notes on Nationalism* that:

> The intensity with which they are held does not prevent nationalist loyalties from being transferable...For the past fifty or a hundred years, transferred nationalism has been a common phenomenon among literary intellectuals...for an intellectual, transference has an important function...It makes it possible for him to be much more nationalistic...than he could ever be on behalf of his native country, or any unit of which he had real knowledge. When one sees the slavish or boastful rubbish that is written about Stalin, the Red Army, etc., by fairly intelligent and sensitive people, one realizes that this is only possible because some kind of dislocation has taken place. In societies such as ours, it is unusual for anyone describable as an intellectual to feel a very deep attachment to his own country. Public opinion - that is, the section of public opinion of which he as an intellectual is aware - will not allow him to do so. Most of the people surrounding him are sceptical and disaffected, and he may adopt the same attitude from imitativeness or sheer cowardice: in that case he will have abandoned the form of nationalism that lies nearest to hand without getting any closer to a genuinely internationalist outlook. He still feels the need for a Fatherland, and it is natural to look for one somewhere abroad. Having found it, he can wallow unrestrainedly in exactly those emotions from which he believes that he has emancipated himself. God, the King, the Empire, the Union Jack - all the overthrown idols can reappear under different names, and because they are not recognized for what they are they can be worshipped with a good conscience. Transferred nationalism, like the use of scapegoats, is a way of attaining salvation without altering one's conduct.

...Among the intelligentsia, colour feeling only occurs in the transposed form, that is, as a belief in the innate superiority of the coloured races. This is now increasingly common among English intellectuals, probably resulting more often from masochism and sexual frustration than from contact with the Oriental and Negro nationalist movements. Even among those who do not feel strongly on the colour question, snobbery and imitation have a powerful influence. Almost any English intellectual would be scandalized by the claim that the white races are superior to the coloured, whereas the opposite claim would seem to him unexceptionable even if he disagreed with it.

How well he describes, three years before even the very first coloured immigrants arrived on our shores, the mentality that has produced the multi-racial society. Such inverse racism is all too important a feature of the establishment to-day.

SEARCH FOR SURVIVORS

IN view of the impending appeals of Zundel and Ross against conviction for "falsifying history" and the prosecutions promised of various, as yet undiscovered, "Nazis" in the U.K. for "crimes against humanity" or like atrocities, it appears to us appropriate to consider the implication of the number of Holocaust survivors who have come, and continue progressively to come to light, in recent years. There does appear to be a mystery requiring more attention than it has previously attracted. We wonder how relevant to the current "Nazi hunts" this omission might be.

Have we failed to take into account the extreme ingenuity and inspiration of the majority of the Jewish race? Surely they are not the sort of people to be annihilated by mere Aryans? More credit than is due seems to have been publicly given to the alleged commandants of concentration camps with alleged gas chambers installed. Their infamy all appears to rest on inadequate research and we would like to assist in repairing that omission. So - Do you know a survivor? Or survivors? Please submit your findings by 1st April, 1991. The person who lists the greatest number verified either from personal knowledge or mention in the media will receive a year's subscription to the **Jewish Chronicle** provided by the Editor of **Candour.**

THE HIRD IN-STINK

IF you have the wherewithal
Albeit a Chinee
Rt. Hon. Hird gets lyrical
To call you refugee

And at a stroke be British
To Hell with history
For here is Tory death-wish
To nationality.

Hong Kong, we must be partial
And cream-off from your top
It really isn't racial
When "do-gooding" calls for "stop".

Right honourable is this Hird
To Tory treachery
Their pre-election by-word
For ethnicality

"Come one, come all" is turning
The native British throng
To something more Conserving
Than a London-based Hong Kong.

B.E. BIGGS

THE GREENS - AND US!

With acknowledgement...

'No, we're not on the right, we're in the right'

and apologies to the **Weekend Telegraph Magazine**!

'No, we're not on the right, We're Right as opposed to Wrong!'

BOLTHOLE COURTESY OF E.C.

NEW E.C. directives on the right of residence in the U.K. drive a Euro-juggernaut through what is left of our immigration laws, and could be used by Hong Kong people as a bolthole, claimed Jonathan Aitken M.P. in a Commons debate last month. A Portuguese passport could be obtained by owning a house in Portugal for three years. Anyone from H.K. refused entry to Britain has only to buy a cheap villa in Portugal and within three years they'd be able to bring in their entire family. Despite Mr. Aitken's warning, a motion to approve the directives was carried without a division. Where was Great White Hope Tebbitt, we ask?

FANFARE FOR 1992?

E.C. staff in Brussels in charge of publicising the 1992 barrier-free single market have adopted a pop song as their unofficial anthem. The name of the group performing it? The Kinks!

TAPES FROM FOREST HOUSE - If it's Truth you want, it's Candour's cassettes you need! Send an s.a.e. to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT for our latest list.

VINTAGE NATIONALIST PAPERS - A mine of information for collectors of pre- and post-war material. Send an s.a.e. to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT for our latest list.

Read SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy for 80p. from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £6 OVERSEAS £8 U.S. $15 A/M

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.